

OCT - 3 1957

PERIODICAL OFFICE

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA  
LIBRARY EXTENSION PUBLICATION

VOL. XVII

OCTOBER 1951

No. 1

READING FOR FREEDOM

By

L. O. KATSOFF



CHAPEL HILL

MCMLI

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARY



LIBRARY UNIV. OF  
NORTH CAROLINA

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA  
LIBRARY EXTENSION PUBLICATION

VOL. XVII

OCTOBER 1951

No. 1

---

READING FOR FREEDOM

By

L. O. KATTSOFF

Department of Philosophy



---

CHAPEL HILL

MCMLI

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARY

*Published four times a year, October, January, April, and July, by the  
University of North Carolina Library. Entered as second-class matter  
February 5, 1926, under the act of August 24, 1912  
Chapel Hill, N. C.*

# CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
CHAPTER I. THE STRUGGLE AGAINST COMMUNISM .....	7
1. The Struggle against Communism <i>Peace Can Be Won</i> , by Paul G. Hoffman	
2. The Necessity for Understanding Ideas <i>Nineteen Eighty Four</i> , by George Orwell	
CHAPTER II. THE ATTACK AGAINST DEMOCRACY .....	9
1. Enemies of Democracy <i>Patterns of Anti-Democratic Thought</i> , by David Spitz	
2. Techniques of Causing Confusion <i>Confuse and Control</i> , by Department of State	
CHAPTER III. THE COMMUNIST THEORY OF STATE .....	14
1. The Challenge to Democracy <i>The Communist Manifesto</i> , by K. Marx and F. Engels	
2. The State and Revolution <i>The Political Theory of Bolshevism</i> , by H. Kelsen	
CHAPTER IV. THE COMMUNIST THEORY OF MAN .....	17
1. The Nature of Man <i>Human Nature</i> , The Marxian View by V. Venable	
2. How to Change Personality-Soviet Style <i>Tell the West</i> , by J. Gliksman	
CHAPTER V. THE COMMUNIST THEORY OF EDUCATION .....	19
1. Totalitarianism Education—Soviet Style <i>The Country of the Blind</i> , by George S. Counts and N. Lodge	
2. How to Raise Children—Soviet Style <i>"I Want to be Like Stalin,"</i> by Yesipov and Goncharov	
CHAPTER VI. THE COMMUNIST THEORY OF SCIENCE .....	23
1. Science as Servant of Politics <i>The Country of the Blind</i> , by George S. Counts and N. Lodge (ch. v)	
2. Soviet Biology <i>Heredity, East and West</i> , by Julian Huxley	
CHAPTER VII. THE COMMUNIST THEORY OF FREEDOM .....	26
1. Stalin—Dictator of the Soviet Union <i>Stalin—A Political Biography</i> , by I. Deutscher	

	<i>Page</i>
2. Freedom—Soviet Style <i>The Political Theory of Bolshevism</i> , by H. Kelsen	
CHAPTER VIII. THE NATURE OF DEMOCRACY .....	29
1. Jefferson—the Father of American Democracy <i>Thomas Jefferson on Democracy</i> , edited by Saul K. Padover	
2. Democracy as a Way of Life <i>The Democratic Way of Life</i> , by T. V. Smith and Lindemann, E. C.	
CHAPTER IX. THE DEMOCRATIC THEORY OF FREEDOM .....	33
1. The Motif of Freedom <i>The Democratic Way of Life</i> , by T. V. Smith and Lindemann, E. C.	
2. Tolerance and Freedom <i>Shall Not Perish from the Earth</i> , by Ralph Barton Perry	
CHAPTER X. THE DEMOCRATIC THEORY OF MAN .....	36
1. The Man—the Individual <i>Characteristically American</i> , by Ralph Barton Perry	
2. The Individual in the United States <i>U. S. A. The Permanent Revolution</i> , edited by R. W. Davenport	
CHAPTER XI. THE DEMOCRATIC THEORY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE .....	40
1. Education for Democracy <i>Thomas Jefferson on Democracy</i> , edited by Saul K. Padover	
2. Science for Human Welfare <i>Can Science Save Us?</i> by George A. Lundberg	
CHAPTER XII. THE DEFENSE OF DEMOCRACY .....	45
1. The Struggle for the World <i>The Tactics and Strategy of World Communism</i> , by the Committee of Foreign Affairs	
2. The Community Party and Minority Groups <i>The Negro and the Communist Party</i> , by Wilson Record	
REFERENCE BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	49
DIRECTORY OF PUBLISHERS .....	50
ADDITIONAL READING .....	50
LIBRARY EXTENSION PUBLICATIONS	
VOLUMES XV, XVI AND XVII .....	Inside back cover



## P R E F A C E

The aim of this study outline is to bring to those who read it some clarification of present-day issues. The Communist challenge to democracy as a way of life is, today, the outstanding example of all totalitarian movements. If you study this bulletin carefully and earnestly read the material cited, you may begin to see how totalitarianism threatens the democratic way of life and so be better prepared to protect freedom from authoritarianism in whatever form the threat appears. Before you can protect what you believe you must understand both what you believe and what you oppose.

In this bulletin, the word "communism" is used to refer to the theories of Marx and Lenin as revised by Stalin and to the way of life practiced today in the Soviet Union which is believed to be a consequence of the theory by the Communists in power there.

The author of this bulletin will be glad to visit your community and discuss these issues if you will write to him at the Department of Philosophy, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

This study outline is based on a series of radio broadcasts recently presented by the University of North Carolina; transcriptions on records of these talks may be obtained from the University Communications Center, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2014



## CHAPTER I

### THE STRUGGLE AGAINST COMMUNISM

In order to find out precisely what is the danger in communism, it is necessary to study the ideas advanced by the Communists, so that we may be able to realize clearly the propaganda, the beliefs, the false insinuations, and the lies which the Communists spread about our way of life. The United States is confronted with the military might of the Communist nations. We know what to do for that: organize armies, call up our men, begin to produce military supplies and meet them on the battlefield. But we are also confronted by ideas, by a new set of goals which are stealthfully infiltrated into our very ways of thinking and believing. Communism seeks to attack us not merely on a military basis. It wants to win our minds. It seeks not merely to conquer territory. It seeks also to win over men's ideas because the Communists know that ideas are not conquered by military force. Ideas can be overcome only by other ideas. The Communists know also that ideas are not conquered by economic productivity.

The struggle between democracy and communism is not one merely for empire or for markets. The struggle between democracy and communism is for world order—a new way of life. It is a battle to bring people to believe either in the democratic way of life or in the communistic way of life. As a consequence of this new phase of war, we seem to be at a loss how to meet this new kind of war. Unless we can show the people of France, the people of China, the people of India that they must be on our side, especially today, if they want to have a good way of life, then we shall lose the world and lose our own way of living.

We are losing the ideological battle because we have made a fundamental mistake. We try to meet communism as a way of life in terms of economics. Later we shall see that the Communists believe every aspect of life is determined by economic consideration and, if we try to meet them on that basis, we are in a sense surrendering to their ideas, which we do not believe because we have confidence that our way of life is based not only on economic considerations, but also on spiritual considerations, on concepts of truth and justice and the dignity of Man.

Thought Defense has four aspects. 1. Know your beliefs; know

what democracy means; know what freedom means; know what majority rule means; know the rights of minority, self-government, dignity, equality. These are the basic concepts of democracy. 2. Know your enemies. Know what they believe by the word "freedom." Know what they think about the classless society, about revolution, about the nature of man. 3. The third aspect of Thought Defense is to know the way in which attack is made on ideas. Know how people exert pressure in order to bring you to change your modes of belief. Know how they insinuate new ideas which subvert and bring confusion into your minds. Know your enemies' modes of attack on the basis of ideas as well as on a military basis. The general who goes to fight the enemy's armies without knowing something about the way in which they attack and retreat and fight will lose. Therefore we who engage in ideological warfare must also know something about the way in which our enemies attack, subvert and try to confuse us. 4. The fourth aspect of Thought Defense is to know how to meet the ideas of the enemy, how to organize, how to bring to our people the true concepts of democracy, the ideas of what the Communists want to propose and propound, what they mean and what they mean for our way of life.

## 1. THE STRUGGLE AGAINST COMMUNISM

*Peace Can Be Won*, by Paul G. Hoffman

- What does the author consider the new type of war to be like?
- What are the four fronts on which this new type of war is being fought?
- Why is it important today to understand the psychological war?
- What is the difference between psychological and ideological war?
- What fields should our free world doctrine cover?
- What, in specific terms, do these freedoms mean to you?

## 2. THE NECESSITY FOR UNDERSTANDING IDEAS

1984, by George Orwell

- What is the author trying to show in this story of the future?
- How does he illustrate the effect of confusion of ideas on people?
- Discuss the possibilities of bringing about a Society of the type he describes.
- Discuss the relevance of this book to what we call Thought Defense. Do you think it is important to keep our ideas free and clear?

*Additional Reading:*

- Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley
- The Key to Peace* by Clarence Marion

## CHAPTER II

### THE ATTACK AGAINST DEMOCRACY

In order to combat successfully the enemies of democracy, it is necessary for us to know how to recognize them. Let us make a few suggestions. An enemy of democracy is one who seeks free speech for himself, not for others. What it means is this: the enemies of democracy are quite willing for you to criticize democracy, to criticize any subject, but not to criticize what they believe. In a Communist state you are free to attack democracy and capitalism and education but you are not free to attack Marxism and communism and the classless society.

In the second place, an enemy of democracy is one who seeks religious freedom for himself but not for others. For example, an enemy of democracy is one who is willing to allow you religious freedom or any kind of freedom provided you believe what he believes. Under communism religion is rejected; therefore, religious freedom under communism really means the freedom to reject religion and not the freedom to discuss it or to worship as you see fit.

In the third place, the enemy of democracy wishes a free press, but a free press only for those who agree with Communist ideas, with his own ideas and not with those of others. It is possible in the press of the Soviet Union to attack democracy, but not communism.

In the fourth place, the enemy of democracy is a person who seeks free thought, but again for his own ideas and not for those of others. In short, the enemies of democracy seek dictation and dictation in all aspects of life, not merely in the political sphere but also in everyday life. What you are to believe, what you are to teach, what you are to do, where you are to work: these under a Communist society are all laid down for you by a small group of people who claim almost the omniscience of God.

At the beginning of this century, the world thought it was well on the way to peace, to progress and to triumphant democracy. By 1914 peace was a dream, progress a hope, and democracy was challenged. The first challenge to democracy came in 1914 when German armies under the Kaiser challenged the democratic way of life. Then the war ended in 1918 and we thought we had made the world safe for democracy. But 1918 began a new era, with a

new challenge to democracy soon to appear on the horizon. Mussolini in Italy and Hitler in Germany issued the first great challenges to democracy. For in these two countries there came into being powers with military forces that did not believe in democracy, that did not believe in freedom of speech, freedom of the individual, the two party system, and the right of the individual to ballot. In 1917 the revolution started in Russia. Democracy was challenged and challenged in a way we had not foreseen.

In 1939 the German armies marched into Poland and the first real challenge to democracy began, not as a threat to our economic system but as a threat to our very beliefs. The Nazis believed that the world was to be organized in terms of a superrace, a superior people, and this was a threat to the very concepts of democracy.

In 1945 came peace and once again we looked forward with the United Nations to a world-wide democracy, but now in the Soviet Union a new threat, this time from the left, began to take shape.

We have tried, but unsuccessfully, to meet the challenge of communism throughout the world. When we attempt an agreement with the Soviets we find that certain terms they use, and which we use, are terms that do not carry the same meaning. The Communist judges all things, all activities and all work in terms of the struggle against democracy. Therefore, whatever we discuss they look at from the point of view of what it will contribute to the world-wide victory of communism over democracy.

We speak of freedom, the right of free people to select their own governments. They speak of freedom, but only the right of certain parties that will be obedient to the government of Russia. We speak of truth and we mean that a statement is true or false objectively. But not for the Communist. If a statement is made which he thinks will aid in the victory of the Communists over the democracies then that is true. But on the other hand if that leads to his own discomfiture it is false. The same way with what is right and what is wrong, and the concept of justice. Whatever leads to the victory of communism is right, whatever looks toward the victory of democracy is wrong. Therefore, how can we discuss world problems with the Soviets and attempt to arrive at any conclusions with them? Whatever we say they may



distort. Whatever they say we do not understand because they use words in ways different from ours. As a result, it becomes necessary to understand what they are driving at and why it is impossible for us to get together with them.

The Soviets believe that any capitalistic democracy is *by very definition* a war-mongering, imperialistic nation. *By definition* means that no matter what you do, you are inevitably a warmonger or an imperialist. This is the way they begin a discussion. How could we ever convince them under such circumstances that we do not want war, that we are not imperialistically inclined. Keep in mind that the Communists are after the construction of a world order which they call the classless society. This is a totalitarian way of life, a way of life that permeates every aspect of human living. Keep in mind that this means a society in which everyone believes virtually the same thing, that it means a society in which the fundamental concepts of man and the state and justice are unique to that particular society.

For the moment let us say something about their goals and how they attempt to achieve them. We have said that their goal is this classless totalitarian society. How do you arrive at such a society? The overthrow of the democratic society according to the Communists can come only by means of revolution. Therefore, the purpose of all Communist activity throughout the world in non-Communist countries is the instigation of revolution. That is one of the goals, one of the things they wish to achieve. The second is wars. A war brings about an economic situation in which a nation wastes a good deal of its resources and, as a consequence, the people get poorer and poorer and will ultimately revolt. How do you start revolutions and how do you begin wars? According to the Communists the way to do that is first to arouse discontent. Next, wars and revolutions are incited by means of riots and class strife. The working classes are stirred up against the managing classes or, conversely, in such a way that it is impossible to reach an agreement, because once workers and management sit around a table and discuss their problems and arrive at a rational conclusion, it inevitably follows that the democratic process is better than the revolutionary process.

We must remember also that the Communists try to bring about in us a distrust of our very ideals. They tell us that democ-

racy is decadent. They tell us that democracy is no longer able to solve its problems and, consequently, they ask us to turn to another way of life which can solve our problems. All of this is based on a theory that is constantly before the Communists. The theory is the important thing, we must remember, if we are to understand how to deal with the Soviets; it is based on ideas about what man is and what he wants and what he seeks; it is based on a concept of what the state is, what it has been, and what it must become.

Behind all of this is the concept of strife between the classes, as a basic factor in social change. All of it is based on the doctrine of *dialectical materialism*. These ideas are aimed at achieving the dictatorship of the proletariat, which they define as "true" democracy, but is not, and finally a totalitarian society called the classless society in which there will be no economic classes, no employers, no employees: everyone working happily with everyone else.

## 1. ENEMIES OF DEMOCRACY

*Patterns of Anti-Democratic Thought*, by David Spitz

What are the two factors of democracy which its opponents deny? Discuss their meanings.

What are the major types of anti-democratic thought? On what grounds do they base their attacks on democracy? Under which type does communism fall?

What are the major methods of attack used by these various types of anti-democratic thought?

Discuss the attacks on democracy in terms of the presumed conflict between freedom and order.

Discuss the methods of meeting anti-democratic thought in a democratic fashion.

## 2. TECHNIQUES OF CAUSING CONFUSION

*Confuse and Control! Soviet Techniques in Germany*, by the U. S. Department of State

Discuss the lessons that we can learn from studying the techniques of the Communists in Germany.

What is the purpose of Communist propaganda? How do you think their ideas can best be met?

Illustrate how the Communists use words in a different sense than we do.

What kinds of ideas in the minds of people make them susceptible to Communist influence? What can be done about it?



What is the aim of the "Party Line," not merely in Germany, but throughout the world? What can be done to meet it?

What is the Soviet version of Korea? How would you point out its errors?

Discuss the uses of literature, riots, etc., in the attempt to confuse.  
Discuss methods of counteracting these tactics.

*Additional Reading:*

*Russia: Its Past and Present*, by Bernard Pares

## CHAPTER III

### COMMUNIST THEORY OF STATE

If you are going to rent a room in your house to a stranger, it is better to find out what he believes than how much money he has. If you have an enemy, you want to know what he thinks about you, both to anticipate attack and to defend yourself against his ideas. This is the essence of Thought Defense. In this chapter we shall discuss the Communist theory of the state and what it means in terms of action and getting along with the Soviet Union.

In 1848 Karl Marx issued the Communist Manifesto. It laid the basis of Communist ideology and began with the words "A spectre is haunting Europe." A spectre of communism. In this *Communist Manifesto*, Karl Marx tells what he thinks both of history and of the state and in particular about the capitalist democratic societies. For Karl Marx history is seen as the record of a struggle between those who try to exploit the labor of others and those poor unfortunates who have nothing but their labor to sell. [The people who exploit the labor of others—the Communist calls the *capitalist* or the *bourgeois*, and the others the *proletariat*.] A proletarian is the one who sells his labor and owns nothing of his own.

The bourgeois class is the capitalist class that developed democracy, according to the Communist, in an attempt to improve its holdings to increase its wealth and to use the labor of others in order to expand its own interests. The theory of the Communist is that the capitalist tried to develop what he called democracy not in the interests of the people at large, but in the interests of his own welfare. As a consequence of this, the Communist insists, the state was created in order to keep the masses of the people in suppression. The democratic capitalist state then becomes not merely the organ of oppression but the organ of world-wide imperialism. It means that democracy is possible only insofar as it expands its markets, only insofar as it takes advantage of the unfortunate condition of people throughout the world.

If you have two capitalist states, each one trying to expand toward world markets, then, say the Communists, imperialism and wars must result. That is to say, capitalist states must

attempt always to get control of the people and wealth of nations regardless of where in the world these things are located. The net result is a struggle on the part of the top capitalist countries for world domination not in the interests of the people but of themselves. In order to control the materials that exist in the world it is necessary frequently to go to war. According to Communist doctrine, then, the state serves the masters. Insofar as it serves the masters it is their agent not only to keep under control any people who try to revolt, but also to keep under control any foreign peoples who refuse to allow the capitalists to exploit them. This means that the state becomes an agent of oppression and the capitalist state is a war-mongering imperialist nation. The Communists insist that when a capitalist gets into power there is no way to get him out of power except by means of bullets; i.e., by revolution.

After the revolution there comes into being what the Communists call the dictatorship of the proletariat. Marx believed that the proletariat would consist of the great majority of people. Stalin on the other hand believes that the proletariat cannot rule themselves and, therefore, the dictatorship of the proletariat must be replaced by a dictatorship of the Communist Party. Marx did think of a dictatorship of the proletariat as a kind of democracy, but Lenin and Stalin quickly changed that notion, so that the dictatorship of the proletariat actually became a dictatorship by a small group of people. No democracy is possible even if the proletariat is the majority, since it still remains true that the dictatorship of the proletariat would mean democracy only for those who agree with the basic Communist ideas.

Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the condition the Soviet Union thinks it is in, you have not merely a dictatorship of the proletariat but also a socialist state. In a socialist state such as the Soviet Union the means of production are owned and controlled by the government. According to the Communist doctrine a socialist state cannot exist in the world until all the states are socialistic; i.e., you cannot have democratic capitalism in the United States and socialistic communism in the Soviet Union. They think that a democratic capitalist society must always be a war-mongering society, and therefore it will always seek conflicts with a socialist state.

After all the states in the world have been forced by means of revolution to become proletariat states, then comes the withering away of the state, and after that the existence of a classless society. In such a society there are no economic classes; no exploited and exploiters. The classless society would be a democracy for a minority—for a few people; those who dared to differ would be liquidated. The classless society would not be a state in the ordinary sense of the term, but all the people would agree or seem to agree on the basic concepts of Marxism and would be under the rule and the totalitarian dictatorship of the directors of the state.

### 1. THE CHALLENGE TO DEMOCRACY

*The Communist Manifesto*, by Karl Marx and F. Engels

Discuss the nature of the class struggle as the dynamic force in history.

What are the chief charges which Marx levels against the bourgeoisie?

How just are they?

What is the role of socialism?

In what sense is the Manifesto a challenge to democracy and not solely to capitalism?

### 2. THE STATE AND REVOLUTION

*The Political Theory of Bolshevism*, by Hans Kelsen

Discuss the relationship between capitalism as an *economic* system and democracy as a *political* system.

What is the difference between communism as an economic system and totalitarianism as a *political* system?

Do you agree with Kelsen that democracy is not tied to a capitalist economy?

In what sense does Stalin use the term "democracy?" Point out the difference between his use of the term and ours.

Contrast the role of the State as Stalin conceives it with the way we conceive it.

#### *Additional Reading:*

*Lenin*, by David Shub

*Theory and practice of Communism*, by R. N. C. Hunt



## CHAPTER IV

### COMMUNIST THEORY OF MAN

What does the Communist think about the nature of man? This question is important because the way the Communist thinks of man may determine what he is going to do to man. For the Communist, people are defined in terms of work, and for the Communist the important thing about human beings is the fact that they are distinguished from animals when they begin to produce the means of life. The Communist really is trying to say that what your character or your personality is, is determined by what you produce and how you produce it. Not merely that, but the ideas you have, the things which you consider right and wrong, the very language you have—even the very religion that you possess—are all determined by the material ways people have of producing the necessities of life. This means that your personality, your individuality, the things you think about are the results not of truth or religion or something else, but simply the result of the industry, the kind of work you do. This is really to say that all men are created for and by the material modes of production, and not as we believe to have industries and factories in order to develop the things which people need. This theory is known in communism as *historical materialism*.

Man, therefore, according to the Communist, is distinguished from animals simply by the fact that he can produce the material means for his living and does not have to go out and look for them in the field. Engels, one of the great Communist theorists, said that labor created man. Therefore, it would follow that if labor created man, to be a man you must labor. Out of this the Communists have developed a slogan which has a good deal of appeal and, as a matter of fact, we must admit also has a good deal of validity. The slogan is "From each according to his ability and to each according to his needs." If we take the first part of the slogan: *From each according to his ability*, and add to it the idea that labor created man, it would mean that each person must work to the fullest extent of his ability, and this means compulsory work. Ability is to be determined by the commissars and each increase in production is followed by a step-up in the amount which is to be expected from each

according to his ability. The whole life of the individual must be seen in terms of a large machine industry. From each according to his ability means from each according to how much he can put in on a large machine industry.

The second part of the slogan is *to each, according to his need*. Need in what respect? If man is nothing but a producing animal, if man is to be organized according to the way in which a large machine industry is to be organized, then to each according to his need would mean his need as a worker. As a matter of fact, this is the essence of the Soviet labor camps today. The Soviets treat men in labor camps simply as if they were nothing but engines, cogs in a large machine industry. They attempt to change them by subordinating them to an iron discipline of work, work, and nothing but work. The Communists believe man to be nothing but an animal who can produce and, as a consequence, if that is all he is, then he must be treated as the other machine that produces material things is to be treated, that is to say, as a machine.

## 1. THE NATURE OF MAN

*Human Nature, The Marxian View*, by Vernon Venable (chaps 1-7)

Does the Marxian view of man consider him to be part of nature or outside nature?

What differentiates man from the beasts of the field, according to the Marxian view?

Does Marx consider human nature eternal or in process of change?

How does this view of human nature reflect itself in the Marxian view of history?

Discuss historical materialism.

What is the significance of the Marxian view of human nature for the structure of the society?

## 2. HOW TO CHANGE PERSONALITY—SOVIET STYLE

*Tell the West*, by Jerzy Glikzman

What is a "forced labor camp?"

Discuss the way in which people are treated in these labor camps as indicative of the Communist theory of human nature.

How do the Communists justify their disregard of human feelings?

Discuss the Communist theory of remolding character through productive work and show how the theory depends on what you call "character."

What happens to people in these labor camps?

*Additional Reading:*

*Darkness at Noon*, by Arthur Koestler



## CHAPTER V

### COMMUNIST THEORY OF EDUCATION

Whatever controls the minds and thoughts of the people and especially of the younger people controls the future. Everything that is done in the Soviet Union is being done in order to further the class struggle and the victory of the Proletariat classless society. It is in the light of this that we must attempt to understand what the Soviets have done with respect to the educational system. What happens when a totalitarian regime takes over is that every aspect of life from the cradle to the grave becomes dictated by a central authority. Conformity becomes a demand, and a board of overseers for the dictators comes into existence. Any deviation from the orthodox doctrine then becomes treason, and means of course that you are subject to trial and death or the labor camps.

If the people are to think the proper thoughts as well as do the proper things, it becomes necessary to educate them from the cradle as far as possible in the proper ideological way of thinking. The Communists believe that the entire educational system must be made to serve the political aims of the Communist Party and must be so oriented as to capture the minds of youth and get them to believe what the politicians in the central committee want them to believe. If an educational system is to serve a political organization, it would inevitably follow that the educational system must distort facts to make those facts prove what the politicians wish them to prove. The consequence is that the entire educational system becomes a gigantic propaganda machine whose aim is to fashion the minds and opinions of all youth and all people.

This means that teachers must teach in accordance with the ideological presuppositions of the Communist Party. It means that professors must lecture in a strictly orthodox fashion. In many classrooms there must sit a person who is sent deliberately to make sure that he who lectures does so from the proper point of view and with the proper prejudice in his viewpoint. A student may rise and challenge the professor if he should cite only Western scientists. One would expect a university professor to cite his sources and his authorities in such a way as to prove what he

is trying to demonstrate, but fear of being reported will make the professor search among manuscripts until he can find a Soviet scientist who could prove the point he was trying to make. It is clearly impossible for a professor, or any teacher for that matter, to feel that what it is necessary to do is to present the truth to the student as he sees it.

Every aspect of the school system of the Soviet Union is a part of the political party of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union. Actually the school system in the Soviet Union is divided into two parts. One division is at the youth and adult level and its function is to develop and train people to become properly indoctrinated members of the party, and to be leaders in the struggle against world democracy. Soviet teachers are taught by their superiors to indoctrinate against the United States in particular and against any democracy in general. From the elementary textbooks upward one finds that students are taught that their teachers themselves are in the advanced line of fire of the ideological struggle. They are taught science not that they may know and master the world about them, but rather that they may know the foundations of the Communist world outlook to be supposedly better than any other world outlook. They are taught geography not that they might know something about the earth's surface, but rather to show the advantages of the Soviet Union over capitalist countries and to show to what extent the Soviet Union will be able to master the world in any coming struggle. They are taught literature not that they might learn to appreciate finer writing, but rather to be shown that love for the Soviet Union means hatred to the enemies of the Soviet Union. They are taught psychology not as a science for understanding human behavior, but rather as a science in which a world view is propagated.

Education, said Stalin, is a weapon. If education is a weapon, it must be directed against something. Actually, the Communist Party recognizes that the school is only a center for the dissemination of Communist ideology and morality. The Communist Party demands that the school develop pride in the Soviet Union, loyalty to the motherland Russia, and readiness to defend the interests of the Soviet state regardless of what those interests are, and as dictated by Stalin and the political bureau. How can these youth of the Soviet Union ever come to an adequate understanding of what we are trying to do, when from every aspect of their

educational system there comes this tremendous amount of propaganda? In 1948 a certain publishing house in Russia was attacked by the Communist Party because it had published a book by a Russian economist who had treated objectively the problem of bourgeois economics. The word "objectively" means that this man had simply taken the facts of bourgeois economic societies and had tried to analyze them without any propagandistic bias. This was a crime, a crime against the Soviet Union, and for this the publishing house was attacked and the author of that book forced to recant. Objectivity has no place in a war, say the Russians, and in this war they are struggling against the ideology of the democracies. The demand is made by the Soviet Union that all publishers be responsible to the Party, and they must take necessary steps to improve the ideological context of every book published, so that these books preach the Communist ideology. The idea that science is unrelated to the class struggle is declared false. In the same way in the press and, of all places, in comic magazines. The Central Committee of the Communist Party caused an editor of a comic magazine to be fired, because the magazine was not an organ of Soviet satire against the capitalist democracies. The net result of all this is that there grows up today in the Soviet Union millions of youth indoctrinated with ultimate hatred against truth, objectivity and democracy, resulting in a virtual impossibility to reeducate this youth. The millions of youth now in the Soviet Union who are being brought up on Communist ideology will find it very difficult to leave their own country's ideology and to understand the rest of the world. Truly it has been said that the Soviet Union has become a country of the blind, and as for the teacher in the Soviet Union, he is forced to lecture, forced to attend lectures, forced to teach only what the party dictates. Deviations are so easy that the life of a teacher becomes constantly one of fear; failure means that his or her position is in jeopardy, and may mean not only loss of a job but also may mean that the teacher might be declared an enemy of the people.

## 1. TOTALITARIAN EDUCATION—SOVIET STYLE

*The Country of the Blind*, by George S. Counts and Nuncia Lodge (chaps vii-ix)

What is meant by saying "education is a weapon?"

Discuss the effects of authoritarian education on the minds of people.

What is meant by saying that "the Soviet Union is a country of the blind?"

Why is it important for us to realize the kind of education of the Soviet youth?

Why is this form of authoritarianism a real challenge to the west?

What are the basic principles in terms of which literature, science, art, etc., are criticized in the Soviet Union?

Discuss methods of making the people conform to the Soviet ideology.

## 2. HOW TO RAISE CHILDREN—SOVIET STYLE

*"I Want to be Like Stalin"* by Yesipov and Goncharov

Secure a primer from your community elementary school and discuss the differences between it and the Russian primer.

What ideals are being inculcated by this primer? Discuss their effect.

What type of youth will be the result of such attitudes? Discuss.

Why is a text on pedagogy important in understanding the Soviet Union?

Discuss the effects of the Soviet educational philosophy on the possibility of peace with the Soviet Union.

What type of individual is it the aim of Soviet education to produce? Compare with that of American education.

Discuss the effects of the Soviet educational system on the intellectual outlook of the Soviet people.

Contrast the control of the Soviet educational system with the absence of control in American schools.



## CHAPTER VI

### COMMUNIST THEORY OF SCIENCE

The totalitarian character of communism is made evident in many aspects of life, even in that activity known as science. When the atom bomb exploded on Nagasaki and Hiroshima, the people of the world became aware of one of the results of science, and science became a household word. What is interesting is that throughout the centuries there have existed groups that tried to dictate the results of science on political or other grounds. For example, Galileo was condemned and forced to recant because he asserted that the earth moved, and this was contrary to popular religious beliefs of his day. "Yet, the earth does move." No one can tell science what it *must* find; and the scientist must be free of political or other pressures to seek the truth, whatever popular beliefs it contradicts.

Under communism this cannot be the case because science and the class struggle go together. Science too is a weapon against democracy and against freedom. It seems that the Communist Party in its struggle against nature and against its enemies wants science as a weapon and also to help in its struggle to build a socialistic society throughout the world. It is the Communist Party which decides when science is in harmony with its doctrine, and not the scientists themselves. As a matter of fact, on matters of science as on all other matters in the Soviet Union under communism, the word of the Communist Party is final. This means that anything which the Party thinks harmful must be eradicated.

In 1932 a conference of scientists passed a resolution demanding that the study of the biological inheritance of individuals be developed in conformity with the principles of communism. This was equivalent to an edict dictating how science is to be developed. It meant that the principles of communism and not the principles of science were to be the deciding factor in what was right and what was wrong in science. The ideas of science, then, were of necessity to be in accord with Communist theory regardless of the evidence. Experiments running counter were ridiculed and, as a matter of fact, the scientists who dared propose evidence against Communist theory were in danger of losing their positions.

In 1948 Lysenko, a Russian biologist, discussed biology from the point of view of a contrast between reactionary biology and progressive biology, capitalist biology and socialist biology, the West against the Soviet. He attacked the science of others like Poliakov, Zhebrak and Schmalhausen as reactionary, attacked them not as bad scientists, but rather because they appealed to experiments and not to doctrine, to prove what they were saying. Even scientific beliefs must conform to political ideology! After this speech of Lysenko in 1948, forty-nine other scientists declared themselves to be on the side of Lysenko. It was a bid for communism rather than a search for truth, to which these adhered. The amazing thing in this was that Lysenko won the debate because he informed the audience that the Central Committee of the Communist Party had approved his address. After that the only thing that would save the other scientists was recantation. The opponents of Lysenko had to surrender not because the scientific evidence was against them but because the Communist Party had spoken!

Suppose President Truman's cabinet got together and decided to believe that hybrid corn was contrary to democratic principles and, therefore, scientists should prove that there could not be any such thing as hybrid corn! They would be analogous to what the Central Committee has done. Now, if the cabinet also had the power to fire any scientist who believes otherwise—as a traitor to the country—you would have the kind of situation which exists in U.S.S.R. today. The nearest thing we ever had in this connection in the United States were the Tennessee anti-evolution laws. As a free American, one probably finds it difficult to believe this about the Soviet Union, but it follows as a necessary course of action when you consider science, a weapon in a struggle against others, rather than as we do, a means toward achieving a better world to live in!

Throughout the centuries the struggle for freedom of science has been a terrible and bitter one. Throughout the centuries the opponents of science have tried hard to make it the subject of dictation of some one or another political or other views. We have now reached the point where we thought that science was free to seek the truth as it sees it, where science was free to seek the truth as evidenced in the facts. On the basis of this development of science we have had in our world a tremendous



increase in all sorts of machinery and in all sorts of improvements in our ways of living.

## 1. SCIENCE AS SERVANT OF POLITICS

*The Country of the Blind*, by George S. Counts and Nuncia Lodge (chap vi)

What is meant by saying that science is a servant of politics, and by the expression "bourgeois physics?"

Discuss the possible effects of such a belief on scientific investigation.

Can you describe attempts by other groups to subordinate scientific investigation to special beliefs?

Show how this control of science follows from the basic ideas of Communist ideology.

What is "dialectical materialism" and how is it related to science?

What is the effect on the scientists themselves of such dictation?

## 2. SOVIET BIOLOGY

*Heredity, East and West*, by Julian Huxley

What does Huxley believe to be the major issue at stake in the Soviet biological controversy? Why?

What biological issues are involved?

What is the ideological issue involved?

Why do the Soviets favor Lysenko's theory?

What light does his controversy show in the need to keep clear the truth of a scientific statement and its relation to various types of dogma?

Do you see any similarities between this controversy and that of the debate between Darrow and Bryan in the Tennessee anti-evolution case?

Discuss the relation between science and political ideology under communism and under democracy.

## CHAPTER VII

### COMMUNIST THEORY OF FREEDOM

Communists make a great thing of the concept of freedom. They tell us that in a Communist world people will be free and that all will have equal rights. What do Communists mean by the word "freedom"? They speak of what they call the dictatorship of the proletariat, by which they claim to mean the dictatorship or the rule of the masses of the people. Stalin has changed this to mean the dictatorship of the Communist Party, by means of a rationalization. A dictatorship of the Party, he claims, is really a dictatorship of the people and, therefore, is "true democracy." What he means is that the Communist Party is presumably the representative of the people of the Soviet Union. Since they are the representatives of the people, what they do is actually in his eyes what the people are doing.

But the Communist Party in the Soviet Union embraces a very small group of people. Therefore, what we have in the Soviet Union today is actually a dictatorship of the Party and not a rule of the masses of the people. The Party is the master of the people and as such is not equivalent to any political party as we know the term in the United States.

It is true that the people presumably and apparently elect the members of their ruling organizations. But actually the nominees, the candidates, are set up in the Soviet Union by the Party and not by the people. There is only one party, one slate of candidates and only one way to vote.

According to the Communist, inequality among people is the result of the class struggle. You only have inequality where you have economic groups, some of them oppressing others; you have two groups, one owning the modes of production and the other simply selling their labor. Stalin defined equality to mean the abolition of classes. By proclamation there are no classes in the Soviet Union. Therefore, it would follow that there is no inequality. However, this is absurd and erroneous, because there is a tremendous amount of inequality in the Soviet Union, some of which is perfectly obvious.

In addition to all of this the Communists like to point to their constitution of 1936 which is supposed to be evidence of their

democracy. There is a very interesting point about it. The Constitution of the Soviet Union of 1936 reads very much like parts of the American Constitution. The Bill of Rights on which we pride ourselves is repeated in the Constitution of the Soviet Union. The Constitution of the Soviet Union guarantees on paper equal rights to all, the election of their legislative and executive organs by the people. It guarantees freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, the right of organization and the inviolability of persons and the security of correspondence. But in the Soviet Union there is only one legal party. For all intents and purposes that means the right to elect the executive and legislative organs of the government does not really exist. Such a state of affairs is hardly democracy as we know it. The right of organization is guaranteed by the Constitution but all organizations in the Soviet Union are under political control.

It is true that the Constitution of the Soviet Union provides equal rights for all people, but it really means equal rights for all Communists because, if you are not one, then you are an "enemy of the people" and therefore have no rights.

In the same way when we talk about freedom of speech and of the press in the Soviet Union we must recognize what freedom means. Freedom, Lenin had said, is not inconsistent with the rule and dictatorship of one person. Therefore, freedom of speech and freedom of the press in the Soviet Union are not inconsistent with the rule and dictatorship of one person over the right to speak and the right to publish in the Soviet Union.

What freedom means in the Soviet Union is freedom to carry on the class struggle but not to carry on a struggle against the ideas of the Communist Party.

## 1. STALIN—DICTATOR OF THE SOVIET UNION

*Stalin—A Political Biography*, by Isaac Deutscher

Discuss the extent to which Stalin is driven by an idea rather than the lust for power.

From your reading of this book to what degree would you say Stalin is absolute dictator of the Soviet Union?

Do Stalin's hopes and personality throw any light on contemporary events? Why or why not?

How does Stalin believe revolution in various countries is to come? What does he mean by "revolution from above?"

Discuss the conflict in Stalin's career between his Russian nationalism and Communist internationalism.

## 2. FREEDOM—SOVIET STYLE

*The Political Theory of Bolshevism*, by H. Kelsen (pp. 43-59; 221-247)

*Soviet Politics*, by Barrington Moore

What does Kelsen call the postulate of democracy?

Discuss the difference between "formal democracy" and "true democracy."

Why did Lenin reject democracy in a capitalist state?

Discuss the difference between the Soviet Constitution and the realities in the Soviet Union.

How does Stalin justify the existence of only one party? What does a one-party system do to political freedom; i.e., the right to oppose the party in power?

Discuss the idea of freedom as we know it and indicate possible threats to it other than from the Communists.

## CHAPTER VIII

### NATURE OF DEMOCRACY

The time has now come to examine our own beliefs. The best statements of the things for which democracy stands can be found in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States. These are the platforms of democracy. The record of our achievement is written in our lives, in our political situation, in our schools, in our treatment of man and in our relations with other people. But all of this can be summed up in the words of Abraham Lincoln: "Government of the people, by the people and for the people!" Let us see exactly what this means, since these words express the difference between communism as it is today practiced in U.S.S.R. and democracy in the United States. We have a *government of the people*, not a dictatorship of the proletariat which is really a dictatorship of the Communist Party. We try to govern ourselves and not to dictate to anyone. And those who govern us are responsible to us, not we to them. Congressmen and senators come home every once in a while and talk to their constituents, or people may write letters to their representatives calling them fools or wise men, as they believe. This is more important than people sometimes think because representatives listen to their constituents. Anyone may tell his neighbor that the President is a smart man, or is incompetent. And they need fear no police action or danger. This is true only in a democracy. For the President is ultimately a man *of the people* and will return after his years of service *to the people*. The President is in office to serve the American farmer, teacher, businessman, doctor, lawyer, and so on, and not to be served by them. He may call upon them to serve the people of which they are part; he cannot call upon them to serve him personally.

Democracy was founded first on the belief that people are better able to know their own interests and, second, that every person is able to solve his problems if he is given the facts. In other words, we not only have a *government of the people* but one *by the people* themselves. The farmer knows his farm conditions; if he has the facts about farming he knows his needs better than anyone else. The worker knows his problems—and the same thing is true—he knows more about himself than any-



one else. This does not mean that we do not need experts, either our own or the government's. It means that these experts are there to serve us, to get us the facts on the basis of which we can make our own decisions. In other words, the experts are there to give *advice* on what is best; but we the people must ultimately *decide* what is best. Contrast this with every other system in which a ruling class, or a small group of highly selected people, claims to know more about what people need than the people themselves. They claim to be able to decide what people need and ought to have.

Democracy is dedicated to the belief that people can decide for themselves. This gives the people a responsibility. It means to the extent that they take part in the election of their governors, they are aiding the survival of democracy, and to the extent that they fail to take part and do not vote they betray their democracy.

But it is possible to have government of the people and by the people and yet not have democracy! The government may be run not in the interests of *all* the people but only for special groups. In a democracy government must also be *for* the people and this means for *all* the people. Only in a democracy is there supposed to be and can there be a government which acts not in the interests of a special group but for *all* the people. In a democracy to the extent that the government acts for special interest groups, it loses its democratic nature. This is what makes democratic government so difficult, for it must try to take into account the interests of farmer, laborer, businessman, professional man, teacher, and so on.

There is one great feature in democracy that no other form of government has ever achieved. That is the method of making changes in the government by *peaceful* methods. In a democracy there is a fundamental reliance in the ballot. If the people do not like their governors, they are free to convince people to agree with them and during the next election vote out one group and vote in another.

The spirit that pervades Jefferson's writings and the Constitution of the United States is one of good will to all men and a hatred of tyranny and oppression in whatever form and fashion it occurs. Jefferson hated every form of tyranny whether it was a tyranny of the few or of the masses. Jefferson saw that kings could



be, and too often were, cruel and unjust. Democracy was for him a dream of a society which believed and practiced freedom, equality, justice, kindness and wisdom. It aimed to be a government for the wise and just of all ages. And Jefferson felt that the people must control their government, or else it would become a matter of a few wolves ruling over many sheep. The best government, he said, is one under which the people have the most freedom and over which the people have the most control, because power in the hands of a few tends to corrupt them and then these few with the power encroach upon the many by means of coercive laws and even naked force.

To Jefferson, and in our democracy, the government serves to make possible life and liberty; liberty is not subservient to government. Therefore, the State must not be allowed to control men's thoughts and actions. People must be taught and allowed to govern themselves because this is their right and function. Of course people who rule themselves make mistakes, but the people when left alone will correct these errors. And do not kings, dictators and parties also make mistakes? Napoleon died in exile and captivity, Mussolini was hanged, Hitler was a suicide. Each believed himself wiser than the rest of the world, believed that people were children and not very intelligent. Jefferson wanted people treated not as children but as adults. He believed that each and every one had certain rights that ought never to be taken away.

A democracy to be successful must make people safe in the exercise of their freedoms and rights. And it must see that its citizens are educated and have access to all the sources of information and opinions so that decisions may be just and wise. Democracy believes in people and their right to life, liberty and happiness.

### 1. THOMAS JEFFERSON

*Thomas Jefferson on Democracy*, by Saul K. Padover, editor

Discuss the advantages of democracy over other forms of government.

What are some advantages inherent in democracy? Are they avoided by any other form of government?

Discuss the basic principles of democracy as stated by Jefferson.

Discuss Jefferson's idea of the relation of people to their government under democracy.

Can you give a definition of democracy as conceived by Jefferson?

"Discuss how far, if at all, we have moved from democracy in present-day United States.

Is a world-wide democracy possible? Explain.

## 2. DEMOCRACY AS A WAY OF LIFE

*The Democratic Way of Life*, by T. V. Smith and E. C. Lindeman

What do the authors mean by saying that democracy is a state of mind? Discuss.

Discuss the relation between the majority and minority under democracy. In what sense is a minority to be considered a necessity in a democracy?

Discuss the concept of brotherhood as an essential in democracy. Would you limit this concept in any way?

What is the role and place of diversity in a democracy? Illustrate with concrete examples.

*Additional Reading:*

*The Front Is Everywhere*, by W. R. Kintner

## CHAPTER IX

### THE DEMOCRATIC THEORY OF FREEDOM

Communism begins with the existence of classes and people as exploited and exploiters. For communism history is written in terms of class struggle. For democracy the basic and most important thing is the individual person. History is the record of man's struggle not merely for the modes of survival but for liberty and happiness—freedom. From this comes the democratic idea of the government and the state. On this basis the United States has been set up and the lives of its people determined. The United States started because our forefathers wanted freedom and revolted against England. In fact, the history of the United States could be written in terms of this struggle for freedom.

What is *political freedom*? In a sense that is easy to answer. Political freedom exists when the people vote for candidates they also help to select and are not compelled to vote for someone they do not like or who they think are incompetent. The people go to the polls as citizens, examine the list of candidates and cast their vote. It is not necessary to tell anyone for whom to vote. That is not all, political freedom means more. It also means that the candidates are selected by the people, and the party system in the United States is a way of getting candidates selected in the light of popular opinion. No party leaders will try to nominate a person they know the people are against, because they also know he will not be elected.

Political freedom exists when it is possible for people to do what they did in the election when Truman won against Dewey. Everyone, including Dewey, was sure Dewey would be elected—but the people wanted Truman and they got him.

Political freedom exists to the extent that the people actually participate in their government and can change that government. The more people who vote wisely and intelligently, the greater the political freedom. By political democracy is meant the right of people to elect their rulers and to change them by ballot! By political democracy is meant the right of people to retain political power in their own hands, so that they can have opposition candidates without fear of concentration camps or assassination.

A basic principle in democracy is the belief that people are or can become wise enough to choose for themselves. It is believed that whether one is a butcher, a baker, a farmer, a lawyer or whatever else, he is an adult being and can decide for himself. This is a very difficult thing for most to accept. Everyone believes himself smarter than the other fellow, and it is natural for a man to want to rule everyone else. As Thomas Jefferson wrote to a French friend: "We both consider the people as our children, and love them with parental affection. But you love them as infants whom you are afraid to trust without nurses; and I as adults whom I freely leave to self-government."

Here, in a nutshell, *respect for the people* is what makes democracy different from all other forms of government, whether it be the monarchies which Jefferson feared, or the totalitarian governments of today. Whenever you hear someone express the opinion that the people are not capable of managing their own affairs, you are listening to someone whose faith in democracy is weak, to someone who is potentially an ally of totalitarianism. The freedom to think and express yourself must be one for all. And freedom to think and express yourself is founded upon responsibility: the responsibility that man be *educated*. Thomas Jefferson has put this, too, in words that all may understand.

"If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be. The functionaries of every government have propensities to command at will the liberty and property of their constituents. There is no safe deposit for these but with the people themselves; nor can they be safe with them without information. Where the press is free, and every man able to read, all is safe."

Freedom means that people are permitted to live as they choose. It therefore means that the area in which the government can compel them to act must be as small as possible. A person is free if he can choose where he wants to work and live; he is free if he can choose those he wants to govern him; he is free if he can worship according to his own beliefs; and he is free if he can go anywhere without permission in advance either from a government official or from a policeman. Freedom is above all guaranteed when the policeman on the corner is there to protect and help and not there to see to it that they do as told or commanded. The policeman's job is to help people be free and not to keep them in line.



There is one element that must be recognized. Freedom as we know it in a democracy is possible only where there exists a constitution which guarantees the right to choose without fear. Freedom is possible only where there exist laws which cannot be changed simply by the decree of either a person or a government agency. Laws are not merely instruments to aid in governing, but also are checks on the government.

But all of these freedoms depend on the first two mentioned: freedom to disagree and freedom to choose your government. Without these two people can be enslaved by decree and dictatorial laws.

### 1. THE MOTIF OF FREEDOM

*The Democratic Way of Life*, by T. V. Smith and E. C. Lindeman (chap 3)

Why is freedom important, according to democracy?

Discuss the relation between freedom and equality?

Is it possible to have a balance between planning and freedom? What is meant when it is said that unless you do plan you are never really free?

Should there be any restrictions on freedom? Why or why not?

Discuss the methods whereby you can help safeguard freedoms in your community.

Discuss some threats to freedom in your community and ways to meet these threats.

What are the major enemies of freedom? Discuss methods of meeting these demands.

### 2. TOLERANCE AND FREEDOM

*Shall Not Perish From the Earth* by Ralph Barton Perry (chap 4)

Discuss Perry's statement that "liberty is a right to be tolerated."

What does Perry mean by negative and positive liberty? Give examples.

Does liberty imply the right to do as one pleases? If not, what limitation must be placed upon liberty? If it does, how can chaos be prevented?

Discuss the three liberties—legal, civil and political, with respect to their function and limitations.

Give concrete examples of how these liberties are being challenged and indicate ways to preserve them.

## CHAPTER X

### THE DEMOCRATIC THEORY OF MAN

The Declaration of Independence had this to say about man:

"We hold these truths to be self evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with inherent and unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. . . ."

These rights are believed to be the birthright of every person, whether he be a member of one or another political party, whether he be a farmer, a banker, a teacher, a worker or the President of the United States. They are written into and guaranteed by that part of our Constitution known as the Bill of Rights. But notice that democracy believes these rights to belong to *all* people everywhere of whatever race, color or religious belief. True, from time to time people have tried to deny these rights to their fellow citizens, but under democracy such attempts are illegal and are denounced by other citizens. "We the people," not "we, the workers" or "we, the capitalists" but "we, the people." All people are entitled to the rights and privileges of being human. A Korean and a European, a Catholic and a Jew, all are human beings and as such are entitled to live their lives peacefully in as good health as they can and with the minimum essentials at least. As humans, people cannot be treated as machines or as beasts of burden at the will of either other individuals or even the State. True, there are those who would try to dictate to people or to demand complete obedience or would coerce them by force to do their will. But under democracy these things are felt to be wrong. History is the story of the struggle for the right of men to be men and to be free. All the freedoms to which the Constitution of the United States refers are often expressed in judicial decisions, and which the United States seeks to bring about flow from this view of man as of paramount importance. And here is an important point: democracy believes that man must be free because by nature he is free even though others have tried to enslave him. The institutions and the government exist to serve man, not man to serve them.

People have a right not only to life and liberty, but also to happiness. Each and every person under democracy must be free to seek and procure as much happiness for himself as he can. It follows that it must be possible for him to secure those things that help make happiness just as he must be free of the fears, terrors and anxieties that destroy happiness. As a person, one needs food, clothing, shelter, the ability to educate his children, to express himself, to worship as he sees fit, to participate in social functions and to be free of the worry of what will happen when he gets older. A person cannot be happy if he lives in terror of physical violence, or of the knock on his door by a member of some secret police organization. Life can be miserable if a person can pray only behind locked doors in constant fear of mob action; life can become hard and cruel if he is forced to watch his children go hungry or become sick because he does not belong to the "right" political organization. Under democracy, all men everywhere *have* these rights and they are not given them by the State, or the Party, or Society, or anything else—except perhaps by God. Men have those rights regardless of race, color, or creed and regardless of those who do their best to deny them to some.

It is very difficult to maintain the government in its proper role and faction. Government always seeks to increase the range and area of its coercive power. And as it does so too successfully, it encroaches more and more upon the liberties and rights of people. There is a tendency for the enemies of democracy to put government and the State above the interests of the people and to talk of the government and the State as if they alone were real, and the person owed his existence to them. This of course is directly opposed to what democracy means. Under democracy, if a person's life is endangered by criminals, then there must exist a government agency to protect him. If his job is threatened because of his beliefs, then the government agency—the courts—must exist to see that he gets justice. To appeal for protection from violence or injustice, one does not under democracy, need to be a member of any political organization or belong to any group; as long as he is a law-abiding citizen he is entitled to life, liberty and the right to seek happiness.

It is true that we have our differences, and it is true that sometimes it seems as if the machinery of democracy moves

slowly in the correction of injustice. But under what other system is there the right to deal with these injustices at all? If people once reject the right of free criticism and the free and secret ballot, injustice would become a permanent part of the social structure, not to be removed or corrected. There would be nothing that anyone could do about it—not even mention its existence.

The difference in the standard of living between that of the United States and that of other countries is well known. It is true that in earlier years people were exploited, natural resources wasted and profit placed above people. But in recent years more and more factories are constructed with the health and happiness of the workers constantly in view, wage scales are very high compared to what they were, health programs, accident prevention campaigns, recreation facilities, vacations with pay—these and more are now taken for granted. True, we have not achieved a perfect society, but when one considers what has been accomplished, not because of profit or in the interest of the State but because of what is believed about what man is, then we can see the hope and promise of an even better world through universal democracy.

## 1. MAN—THE INDIVIDUAL

*Characteristically American*, by Ralph Barton Perry (chaps I and V)

Why is it important to know what we believe about the nature of man? Be concrete and indicate by example how one's belief may affect one's actions.

Show how the idea that we must treat people as individuals has affected the American outlook.

Discuss our foreign policy from the point of view of the democratic theory of the nature of man as an individual.

Give examples from your own lives how people are treated as individuals and not simply as members of a group.

Show the relation between the democratic view of the State and that of Man as an individual.

Show that individualism does not necessarily imply selfish egotism.

## 2. THE INDIVIDUAL IN THE UNITED STATES

*U. S. A. The Permanent Revolution*, edited by R. W. Davenport

Discuss the transformation that has come over individualism as a doctrine.



How is the right to life of the individual supplemented in the United States?

Why do authors of this book speak of the United States as a permanent revolution?

Discuss the role of the individual in public affairs and private enterprise.

Discuss the increasing role of the individual worker in American industry.

Discuss the United States as an example of the results of a belief in the integrity and ability of all individuals.

## CHAPTER XI

### THE DEMOCRATIC THEORY OF EDUCATION, TRUTH, SCIENCE AND JUSTICE

There are elements in our lives whose importance to democracy is not easily seen, but which provide the cornerstones on which the whole structure rests. These things are truth, justice, education and science. Democracy without these is impossible. If we do not have the truth, how shall we know for whom or for what to vote? If justice is denied, what becomes of equal rights and equal opportunities? If people are not educated, how will they learn to know and use the truth? And if science loses its freedom of inquiry, its right to pursue the truth wherever it may lead, what will become of the people's welfare which in our age depends on scientific progress?

What of Truth? If, as it is written, it is the truth that makes and keeps us free, then it must be clear that we want the truth. Under democracy we must at all times seek the truth and not allow ourselves to be misled. Did General MacArthur disobey directions? Are there Communists in Korea? Is Acheson under the influence of the British? Is cancer curable? Are people simply the result of their environments? These are questions that demand an answer which is true or false apart from what General MacArthur or President Truman want us to believe, apart from political consideration of any sort. Those who would tell you that you must believe certain things because otherwise you go against what they want you to believe in politics or religion—those who refuse to face the truth—they are the enemies of democracy. And you must know the truth! The Communists will tell you that by definition the capitalist exploits you and tries to squeeze you dry, while in Russia the worker lives in a happy condition. Do you know the truth? Do you know the difference between our standard of living—even for our more under-privileged groups—and theirs? Or take another example: there are those who would prevent teachers from talking about communism because they fear that students will be corrupted. These people fear the truth and insult the intelligence of students. Where truth is freely taught, evil and corruption need not be feared. Unless our people know the truth about democracy and communism they can never protect their thoughts against evil doctrines. It is like saying that if we

do not talk about cancer we shall be safe from its attack. This is like the ostrich burying his head in the sand. Under democracy, we do not believe that there is such a thing as class truth, or State truth; there is but the truth and we try to discover it to the best of our abilities.

Thomas Jefferson said in 1816 that "if a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be." This expresses a fundamental idea, without which democracy is impossible. We must provide education for all in order to have freedom for all. But this education must not be the sort that one gives to slaves to keep them enslaved, but to free men so that they can continue to be free. This is what democracy stands for with respect to education: Education for all of such nature that health, happiness, economic well-being and freedom are preserved. Education, if properly provided and free from domination by political or any other group, is always a threat to dictatorship, and tyranny for the tyrant can only disguise tyranny as long as he keeps the people ignorant. Have you ever realized that slavery exists chiefly among the ignorant? This is why those who seek to undermine democracy try to get control of the schools, colleges and universities. In this day of crisis and conflict, the free man must have certain bodies of knowledge in order to defend himself adequately against the ideological attack of those who would enslave him. Free men must be taught to recognize those who would enslave him either through promise of economic rewards or through dogma relating to religion and the spirit. Therefore the free man has knowledge of the way in which people can be either noble or beast-like.

The free man knows that men can both create science and improve the lot of the poor and can destroy and enslave. The free man too knows about history—how people have built empires, improved conditions, sought for truth, fought wars, enslaved as well as freed people. And the free man must know of the great struggle for freedom—of thought, of science, and of life—from people who claimed to know all and the right to rule all. The free man must know the nature of the present crisis, the promises and achievements of dictatorships and the resources and promises of our own democracy. Freedom can only be attained and kept if we are willing to pay the price.

How does education work out in this country? In the

United States under democracy we try and are trying to keep the schools free from false propaganda. We do not want anything taught but the truth. We are trying to make education open to all at every level, so that each child may become what his abilities will allow him to become. It is true that under democracy we continue to strive to make education available to all. You may be a shop-keeper but your son, if he is able, can become a doctor; you may be a mill-worker, but your son may go to the university and study mill management and become a member of management. Education under democracy is conditioned by your abilities and not by your ancestry. This is not always the case, but we are trying to make it so. Under democracy we believe that no one should be excluded from educational opportunity, because universal education based on truth must exist before the world can be a free world.

Why is science, too, a cornerstone of political freedom? First and most obvious, science is what keeps us strong. More than our armies in being, our ships at sea, our fleet of planes, it is science that protects us from the enemy. In the past few years scientists have made great strides in armament development. This kind of science is obviously and unquestionably of tremendous importance to freedom. We spend billions on it every year, because we know that strength is essential to freedom. We know that at the first sign of weakness, the Communists attack, exploit the weakness and conquer from within and without. Yet, vital as this kind of science is, there is another yet more vital to our physical strength, and that is basic science, a rare and lofty atmosphere in which the physicist, the chemist, the bio-physicist, the astrophysicist struggle with the most fundamental and complex of problems about the world and the universe. These scientists are not concerned with the hope of a super-weapon but only with the idea of learning. It is upon this kind of science that the other depends. Who would have thought that Einstein creating the theory of relativity and the magical formula  $E$  equals  $MC^2$  made possible thirty years ago the atom bomb? We must protect this kind of science; it is vital to us. Finally, we must remember the grim truth: that science can be used to enslave, rather than to free; that scientists are men, and ours are free men; that science thrives on freedom of inquiry, for no one man knows what must be explored; on freedom to exchange ideas, for no one man knows



so much he cannot learn from others. This task of free inquiry, wherever it may lead, we leave largely to our universities where there need be no bugaboo of security, since none is needed. We must guard and strengthen this scientific freedom, guard and strengthen the system of university research which fosters and nurtures it.

We must speak, if briefly, about justice, because here again lies an important idea. Remember that we may not be putting these things completely in practice, but they are in our beliefs, and that means that we try to achieve them. In older days there used to be one law for kings and princes and another for serfs and peasants; or one law for citizens and another for foreigners. Then in some places there was one law for believers and another for unbelievers. In Nazi Germany there was one law for Nazis and another for non-Aryans. Under democracy the idea is that there is one law for all and equality for all before the law. In order to establish justice, we have framed our Constitution which in broad terms outlines the basic law of the land and which is applicable to all Americans. Under our form of government it is not possible to make a law directed at a special group or person. And the law courts and lawyers cannot, no matter how high their position, change the law. That is why Communists who try subversive tactics must be given a fair trial. Under democracy we have set up a very complicated set of rules and courts, but all this is to try to give justice to all. If a person is arrested he may be tried by a court and, if he cannot afford a lawyer, provision is made to get him one. Before the law, under democracy, the poor and the rich are to be treated as equals. Democracy stands not for class-justice or class-morality but for morality and justice to all.

## 1. EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY

*Thomas Jefferson on Democracy*, edited by Saul K. Padover

Read the section in *Thomas Jefferson on Democracy* devoted to "Education" and discuss Jefferson's views on the importance of education for democracy.

Discuss the things free men must know in order to remain free.

## 2. SCIENCE FOR HUMAN WELFARE

*Can Science Save Us?* by George A. Lundberg

What does Lundberg consider to be the chief goal of science?

Discuss what Lundberg believes to be the role of science in social change.

What would Lundberg think about making science serve political ends?

Discuss Lundberg's conception of the purpose of education. Do you agree with what he says?

Discuss the relation between free science and free society.

## CHAPTER XII

### DEFENSE OF DEMOCRACY

Communist strategy and tactics take two forms—internal and external to the United States. Externally the Communists try to divide the world into two camps, those for and those against them. This means they will try to embroil the United States as their chief opponent in as many wars as possible and get as many countries as they can against us. This they do by taking advantage of every mistake we make. If Negroes are ill-treated, they will point to that and shout to the colored peoples of the world that America tries to enslave them. If the United States makes trade agreements, they shout that we are exploiting the people of the world. If the United States aids a country to repel invaders, they shout that we are aggressors. This is what happened in Korea, for example, where the invasion of South Korea by North Korea was a threat to world peace and, acting for the United Nations, we took action. The Soviets try in every way to discredit the United States in the eyes of the peoples throughout the world. This has the effect of aiding the Soviets in two ways: First, it weakens the ability of democracies to resist military attack by alienating possible allies; and second, it enables the Communists within the country to pose as friends of the people and thereby get greater control of the people.

But all of this is not enough, because as long as the United States remains a strong and united people, willing to make sacrifices and to fight if necessary to preserve democracy and freedom, communism cannot conquer the world. The Communists therefore try, in conformity with their theory, to stir up hatred and dissension inside the United States to weaken us. How do they do it? Communists always try to *prevent* the solution of problems rather than to solve them. If there is, for example, labor trouble in a community, they will do their best to keep the pot boiling, so that hatred and passion will be aroused. Communists try to get key positions in labor unions in order to put their ideas into effect. They are prepared to come to meetings early and stay late. In this way they can, after others leave, vote through what they want and elect their own people to office. Labor unions are not communistic for the most part,

and American labor is loyal. But a few Communists in strategic positions can play havoc with our economic system. If labor troubles cannot be solved around a table, then the Communists will say that America is not democratic and workers may begin to lose faith in democratic processes. This is what the Communists want to bring about—that the people lose faith in democratic processes.

The Communists believe that reform is possible only through revolution, not through discussion and they are achieving their aims to the extent that they can get people to feel that problems cannot be solved by negotiation. While we may know that the Communists do not themselves deal fairly with labor, they will neither admit this fact, nor, if possible, let it enter into the argument. Communists pose as liberals and humanitarians, whereas they seek only tools for the furtherance of their plans to confuse and confound. The racial problem in the United States is still unsolved and here too the Communists find fertile soil. The vast majority of people who belong to minority groups are loyal to the United States and reject communism. But if you are discriminated against, the struggle sometimes looks hopeless, and the Communist is ready to take advantage of that feeling to undermine confidence in democratic processes. With respect to the Negro problem two things must be kept in mind. First, the Communist is not interested, despite his words, in the Negro as such, but only in him as a possible tool. The Communist will liquidate Negro professional and industrial people as well as white. Second, in the framework of democratic processes Negroes have better hopes for a better future than in the dictatorship of the Communist Party. Under a democratic system the minority has the redress of the ballot. Under a dictatorship, he has no such recourse. When the Communist protests against race prejudice, he is doing so not because he dislikes race prejudice but because he wants converts to communism. Richard Wright discovered this and tells the story in *The God That Failed*. The same thing is true when the Communists shout against anti-Semitism. The Soviet Union has clearly demonstrated in Poland and Russia that if anti-Semitism will further communism they will be anti-Semitic.

There is another group that needs to be mentioned—the so-called intellectual group. These are the people who at one time



found or thought they had found in communism the way to solve man's ills. The faith in democracy that exists in this group was attacked by the Communists through such arguments as "Democracy is corrupt, look at politics." Or, "the press lies, look at the way the papers always distort—they are controlled by the capitalists." Or, "capitalists are selfish, egotistical, blood-suckers out only for profit." But it was forgotten by these intellectuals that the very fact you could point out these evils showed the fundamental rightness of democracy. For example, there are the Kefauver Crime Investigations to point out the facts, and political machinery to clean it up. If the press is controlled by the capitalists, it is strange that they allow the kind of news they often do. If capitalists are all selfish and seek only profit, it is hard to understand Carnegie Funds, Ford Foundations, Rockefeller grants, and so on.

Keep in mind these few illustrations that the goal of all communistic activity is to bring the revolution closer. For this reason they will seek to get key positions in labor, in order to be ready to tie up industry and create disorder. They will infiltrate into liberal groups, in order to play on slogans and cause dissatisfaction. If given the opportunity they will tie up legislative procedure in order to make reform hopeless. But you must be warned. Do not play their game by attacking every person as communistic who seeks reform or better working conditions or more humane treatment of minorities. For, by doing this you will drive good people away from the solution of our real problems. When this happens, and we cannot solve our problems adequately, people will get discouraged and lose faith in democracy.

Communists take advantage of every trick they can to undermine democracy. They will even go along with other enemies of democracy working to undermine freedom, hoping that at the crucial time they will be able to take over. This is what they did with Hitler. They aided the confusion in Germany, trying to break down legislative processes, and hoped that in the confusion they would be able to take over. Hitler outsmarted them, but Germany did after all become a dictatorship and the people lost their freedom. In the United States other groups are at work trying to breed hatred and suspicion. Communists will, if need be, help such groups breed hatred because they hope to be

able to take over. Therefore, if someone tells lies about American minority groups, remember that he, too, is an enemy of democracy and an aid to the Communists.

## 1. THE STRUGGLE FOR THE WORLD

*The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism*, by Committee on Foreign Affairs (pp. 24-62)

What are the Communists trying to achieve? Refer back to the previous chapters in the bulletin for their goals.

Why do the Communists believe war is inevitable?

Discuss the Soviet tactics in the United Nations in terms of their theory and goals.

Discuss the Communist's participation in civil defense cases in the United States in terms of their tactics and goals.

How can you as a citizen in a democracy counteract totalitarian tendencies by democratic measure?

## 2 THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND MINORITY GROUPS

*The Negro and the Communist Party*, by Wilson Record

What tactics will Communists try on minority groups? How can you counteract them?

Why do Communists look to minority groups as possible allies?

Discuss the democratic measures that can be used to solve the problems of minority groups in the United States.

Discuss the effects of Communist propaganda in Asia based on our racial problems. What can we do about it?

## REFERENCE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Com. on Foreign Affairs	<i>Strategy and Tactics of World Communism.</i> 1948. (12) Rep. of Subcom. No. 5. House Doc. No. 619	Dept. of State	\$1.00
Counts, George S. & Lodge, N.	<i>Country of the Blind.</i> 1949. (5, 6)	Houghton	4.00
Davenport, R. W. (ed.)	<i>U. S. A. Permanent Revolution.</i> 1951. (10)	Prentice	3.75
Department of State	<i>Confuse &amp; Control. Soviet Techniques.</i> 1951. (2)	U.S. Gov't.	.30
Deutscher, Isaac	<i>Stalin: A Political Biography.</i> 1949. (7)	Oxford	5.00
Gliksman, Jerzy	<i>Tell the West.</i> 1948. (4)	Gresham	3.75
Hoffman, P. G.	<i>Peace Can Be Won.</i> 1951. (1)	Doubleday	1.00
Huxley, Julian	<i>Heredity, East and West.</i> 1949. (6)	Schuman	3.00
Kelsen, Hans	<i>Political Theory of Bolshevism.</i> 1949. (3, 7)	Univ. Calif.	1.75
Lundberg, G. A.	<i>Can Science Save Us?</i> 1947. (11)	Longmans	1.75
Marx, Karl & Engels	<i>Communist Manifesto</i> (In <i>Das Kapital</i> ) (3)	Mod. Lib.	1.25
Moore, Barrington	<i>Soviet Politics.</i> 1950. (7)	Harvard	4.50
Orwell, George	<i>Nineteen Eighty-Four.</i> 1949. (1)	Harcourt	3.00
Padover, S. K. (ed.)	<i>Thomas Jefferson on Democracy.</i> 1939. (8, 11)	New Amer. Lib.	.35
Perry, R. B.	<i>Characteristically American.</i> 1949. (11)	Knopf	3.00
Perry, R. B.	<i>Shall Not Perish from the Earth.</i> 1940. (10)	Vanguard	1.50
Record, Wilson	<i>The Negro and the Communist Party.</i> 1951 (12)	UNC Press	3.50
Smith & Lindemann	<i>Democratic Way of Life.</i> 1951. (9, 10)	New Amer. Lib.	.35
Spitz, David	<i>Patterns of Anti-Democratic Thought.</i> 1948. (2)	Macmillan	4.50
Venable, Vernon	<i>Human Nature: Marxian View.</i> 1945. (4)	Knopf	3.00
Yesipov & Goucharov	<i>"I Want to Be Like Stalin."</i> 1947. (5)	John Day	2.00

## ADDRESSES OF PUBLISHERS

Department of State, Washington, D. C.  
 Doubleday & Co., Garden City, N. Y.  
 Gresham Press, 11 Broadway, New York 4.  
 Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc., 383 Madison Ave., New York 17.  
 Harvard University Press, 38 Quincy St., Cambridge, Mass.  
 Houghton Mifflin Co., 2 Park St., Boston 7, Mass.  
 John Day Co., Inc., 2 W. 45th St., New York 19.  
 Knopf (Alfred A.), Inc., 501 Madison Ave., New York 22.  
 Longmans, Green & Co., 55 Fifth Ave., New York 3.  
 Macmillan Co., 60 Fifth Ave., New York 11.  
 Modern Library, 457 Madison Ave., New York 22.  
 New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 245 Fifth Ave., New York 16.  
 Oxford University Press, 114 Fifth Ave., New York 11.  
 Prentice-Hall, Inc., 70 Fifth Ave., New York 11.  
 Schuman (George L.) & Co., 203 N. Wabash Ave., Chicago 1.  
 University of California Press, Berkeley 4.  
 University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill  
 Vanguard Press, Inc., 424 Madison Ave., New York 17.

## ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

Baldwin, L. D.	<i>Best Hope of Earth.</i> 1949. (11)	Pittsburgh Univ.	\$3.00
Crossman, R. H. S.	<i>God that Failed.</i> 1949. (7)	Harper	3.50
Ed. Pol. Comm.	<i>Education of Free Men.</i> 1941. (11)	NEA	.50
Hulburd, David	<i>This Happened in Pasadena.</i> 1951. (11)	Macmillan	2.50
Hunt, R. N. C.	<i>Theory and Practice of Communism.</i> 1950. (3)	Macmillan	2.75
Huxley, Aldous	<i>Brave New World.</i> 1939. (1)	Harper	2.50
Kintner, W. R.	<i>The Front Is Everywhere.</i> 1950. (8)	Univ. of Okla.	3.75
Koestler, Arthur	<i>Darkness at Noon.</i> 1948. (4)	Mod. Lib.	1.25
Marion, Clarence	<i>The Key to Peace.</i> 1951. (1)	Heritage	2.00
Pares, Bernard	<i>Russia: It Past and Present.</i> 1949. (2)	New Amer. Lib.	0.35
Schwartz, Harry	<i>Russia's Soviet Economy.</i> 1950.	Prentice-Hall	2.25
Shub, David	<i>Lenin.</i> 1948. (3)	New Amer. Lib.	0.35
Zirkle, Conway	<i>Death of a Science in Russia.</i> 1949. (6)	Univ. Penn. Press	3.75



## LIBRARY EXTENSION PUBLICATIONS

### VOLUME XV

- North Carolina Writers.* Walter Spearman. October 1949. No. 1  
*Thomas Wolfe: Carolina Student.* Agatha B. Adams. January 1950. No. 2  
\$1.00  
*Adventures in Reading, 24th Series.* Mary Cutler Hopkins. April 1950. No. 3  
*The South in Biography.* Emily Bridgers. July 1950. No. 4

### VOLUME XVI

- Modern French Literature in Translation.* Jacques Hardré. October 1950.  
No. 1  
*Paul Green of Chapel Hill.* Agatha B. Adams. January 1951. No. 2  
Cloth bound, \$2.50; Paper, \$1.00  
*Adventures in Reading, 25th Series.* Mary Cutler Hopkins. April 1951. No. 3  
*Other People's Lives, Twelfth Series.* Cornelia S. Love. July 1951. No. 4

### VOLUME XVII

- Reading for Freedom.* L. O. Katsoff. October 1951. No. 1
- 

Subscription per volume, \$2.00; to residents of North Carolina, \$1.50.  
Single copies, 75 cents each; in North Carolina, 50 cents each.  
Exceptions: *Thomas Wolfe* and *Paul Green*, as noted above.  
Frequency of publication was reduced from six to four a year, beginning  
January 1950.

Send for list of previously published *Library Extension Publications*.

Library Extension Department  
University of North Carolina Library  
Chapel Hill, N. C.

